

THE ANNALS
AND
MAGAZINE OF NATURAL HISTORY.

I.—*On early Contributions to the Flora of Ireland; with Remarks on Mr. Mackay's Flora Hibernica.* By the Rev. T. D. HINCKS, LL.D., M.R.I.A.

To the Editors of the Annals and Magazine of Natural History.

GENTLEMEN,

HAVING met with various remarks which seem to imply a peculiar negligence on the part of the Irish in respect of the Natural History of their country, and these remarks having been repeated without any effort to correct them, may I beg permission through your valuable work to make some statements on the subject? As I have for nearly fifty years taken an interest in the botany of Ireland, and as I have had opportunities of knowing ~~many~~ persons who interested themselves about it, I hope I may not be deemed unreasonable, especially as I have no claim of my own to bring forward or any wish to speak lightly of the exertions of late botanists, who I believe would not knowingly claim more than they are fairly entitled to. As these remarks were chiefly suggested by Mr. Mackay's *Flora Hibernica*, or the reviews of it, I beg to acknowledge my own obligation to him for that work, and to express the esteem and regard I have felt for him for more than thirty years that I have had the pleasure of being acquainted with him.

Different opinions are entertained by botanists as to what a local Flora should be. Remarks on the subject have been made by Prof. Henslow*, attention to which might be of much use; but I cannot blame Mr. Mackay, in the *Flora* of such an extensive district as Ireland, for having inserted the generic and specific characters, even though he may not have added to those of Sirs J. E. Smith and W. J. Hooker.

The *Flora* of a country should however do more, it should

* *Magazine of Zoology and Botany*, vol. i.

THE ANNALS
AND
MAGAZINE OF NATURAL HISTORY.

I.—*On early Contributions to the Flora of Ireland; with Remarks on Mr. Mackay's Flora Hibernica.* By the Rev. T. D. HINCKS, LL.D., M.R.I.A.

To the Editors of the Annals and Magazine of Natural History.

GENTLEMEN,

HAVING met with various remarks which seem to imply a peculiar negligence on the part of the Irish in respect of the Natural History of their country, and these remarks having been repeated without any effort to correct them, may I beg permission through your valuable work to make some statements on the subject? As I have for nearly fifty years taken an interest in the botany of Ireland, and as I have had opportunities of knowing ~~many~~ persons who interested themselves about it, I hope I may not be deemed unreasonable, especially as I have no claim of my own to bring forward or any wish to speak lightly of the exertions of late botanists, who I believe would not knowingly claim more than they are fairly entitled to. As these remarks were chiefly suggested by Mr. Mackay's *Flora Hibernica*, or the reviews of it, I beg to acknowledge my own obligation to him for that work, and to express the esteem and regard I have felt for him for more than thirty years that I have had the pleasure of being acquainted with him.

Different opinions are entertained by botanists as to what a local Flora should be. Remarks on the subject have been made by Prof. Henslow*, attention to which might be of much use; but I cannot blame Mr. Mackay, in the *Flora* of such an extensive district as Ireland, for having inserted the generic and specific characters, even though he may not have added to those of Sirs J. E. Smith and W. J. Hooker.

The *Flora* of a country should however do more, it should

* *Magazine of Zoology and Botany*, vol. i.

THE ANNALS
AND
MAGAZINE OF NATURAL HISTORY.

I.—*On early Contributions to the Flora of Ireland; with Remarks on Mr. Mackay's Flora Hibernica.* By the Rev. T. D. HINCKS, LL.D., M.R.I.A.

To the Editors of the Annals and Magazine of Natural History.

GENTLEMEN,

HAVING met with various remarks which seem to imply a peculiar negligence on the part of the Irish in respect of the Natural History of their country, and these remarks having been repeated without any effort to correct them, may I beg permission through your valuable work to make some statements on the subject? As I have for nearly fifty years taken an interest in the botany of Ireland, and as I have had opportunities of knowing ~~many~~ persons who interested themselves about it, I hope I may not be deemed unreasonable, especially as I have no claim of my own to bring forward or any wish to speak lightly of the exertions of late botanists, who I believe would not knowingly claim more than they are fairly entitled to. As these remarks were chiefly suggested by Mr. Mackay's *Flora Hibernica*, or the reviews of it, I beg to acknowledge my own obligation to him for that work, and to express the esteem and regard I have felt for him for more than thirty years that I have had the pleasure of being acquainted with him.

Different opinions are entertained by botanists as to what a local Flora should be. Remarks on the subject have been made by Prof. Henslow*, attention to which might be of much use; but I cannot blame Mr. Mackay, in the *Flora* of such an extensive district as Ireland, for having inserted the generic and specific characters, even though he may not have added to those of Sirs J. E. Smith and W. J. Hooker.

The *Flora* of a country should however do more, it should

* *Magazine of Zoology and Botany*, vol. i.

I conceive, as far as possible, discriminate between those plants which are really indigenous, and those which appear to have been introduced, whether at an early or a later period; it should mark the situation in which the plant is found and the different parts of the country; whether abundant or scarce; and on what kind of ground, as limestone, basalt, &c. It should be an object to record the *earliest* notice of each plant, and the name of the discoverer, if it can be ascertained, to which may be added remarks on its nature and uses. And in the case of a country like Ireland, which has its own peculiar language still used in many parts of it, the name given to the plant in that language should be recorded, when known, as well as the common names in English. The author of a local Flora should be a man well acquainted with the past as well as present state of the district, and should be able to make various branches of science contribute to the usefulness of his work. Finally, if like Dr. Johnston, in his Flora of Berwick-on-Tweed, he can render his work entertaining as well as instructive, he will have a stronger claim on the gratitude of those for whom he has been labouring. That my friend Mr. Mackay's work does not meet all these objects is no reason for censuring him, and with respect to the Irish names, unless he had it in his power to give *real* ones, it was much better to omit them altogether, than to do, what was done in another case, manufacture names for the occasion, which a native could hardly recognise.

Mr. Mackay's introduction begins with the remark, "It has been matter of complaint that the history of the natural productions of Ireland has hitherto been neglected," but he considers the censure as one of too great severity. The authoress of an "Irish Flora," published about three years before Mr. Mackay's, viz. in 1833, says, "it has been remarked, that when England and France had their provincial Floras, the botany of this island was as much unknown as that of an island in the Pacific; although its peasantry possessed a very considerable knowledge of plants, which is, &c.—but among its enlightened inhabitants it has remained almost a sealed book, while men of science have been occupied investigating other countries not possessing half its richness in vegetable productions." As a proof, the extraordinary deficiency of information in this science, to be met with in the surveys of counties in Ireland, is brought forward, with some exceptions; and be it remarked, that the works excepted were *published*, or at least some of them, before 1750; i. e. eighty years before the time of making the remark. A reviewer of Mr. Mackay's work in the Dublin University Magazine, in a very

I conceive, as far as possible, discriminate between those plants which are really indigenous, and those which appear to have been introduced, whether at an early or a later period; it should mark the situation in which the plant is found and the different parts of the country; whether abundant or scarce; and on what kind of ground, as limestone, basalt, &c. It should be an object to record the *earliest* notice of each plant, and the name of the discoverer, if it can be ascertained, to which may be added remarks on its nature and uses. And in the case of a country like Ireland, which has its own peculiar language still used in many parts of it, the name given to the plant in that language should be recorded, when known, as well as the common names in English. The author of a local Flora should be a man well acquainted with the past as well as present state of the district, and should be able to make various branches of science contribute to the usefulness of his work. Finally, if like Dr. Johnston, in his Flora of Berwick-on-Tweed, he can render his work entertaining as well as instructive, he will have a stronger claim on the gratitude of those for whom he has been labouring. That my friend Mr. Mackay's work does not meet all these objects is no reason for censuring him, and with respect to the Irish names, unless he had it in his power to give *real* ones, it was much better to omit them altogether, than to do, what was done in another case, manufacture names for the occasion, which a native could hardly recognise.

Mr. Mackay's introduction begins with the remark, "It has been matter of complaint that the history of the natural productions of Ireland has hitherto been neglected," but he considers the censure as one of too great severity. The authoress of an "Irish Flora," published about three years before Mr. Mackay's, viz. in 1833, says, "it has been remarked, that when England and France had their provincial Floras, the botany of this island was as much unknown as that of an island in the Pacific; although its peasantry possessed a very considerable knowledge of plants, which is, &c.—but among its enlightened inhabitants it has remained almost a sealed book, while men of science have been occupied investigating other countries not possessing half its richness in vegetable productions." As a proof, the extraordinary deficiency of information in this science, to be met with in the surveys of counties in Ireland, is brought forward, with some exceptions; and be it remarked, that the works excepted were *published*, or at least some of them, before 1750; i. e. eighty years before the time of making the remark. A reviewer of Mr. Mackay's work in the Dublin University Magazine, in a very

I conceive, as far as possible, discriminate between those plants which are really indigenous, and those which appear to have been introduced, whether at an early or a later period; it should mark the situation in which the plant is found and the different parts of the country; whether abundant or scarce; and on what kind of ground, as limestone, basalt, &c. It should be an object to record the *earliest* notice of each plant, and the name of the discoverer, if it can be ascertained, to which may be added remarks on its nature and uses. And in the case of a country like Ireland, which has its own peculiar language still used in many parts of it, the name given to the plant in that language should be recorded, when known, as well as the common names in English. The author of a local Flora should be a man well acquainted with the past as well as present state of the district, and should be able to make various branches of science contribute to the usefulness of his work. Finally, if like Dr. Johnston, in his Flora of Berwick-on-Tweed, he can render his work entertaining as well as instructive, he will have a stronger claim on the gratitude of those for whom he has been labouring. That my friend Mr. Mackay's work does not meet all these objects is no reason for censuring him, and with respect to the Irish names, unless he had it in his power to give *real* ones, it was much better to omit them altogether, than to do, what was done in another case, manufacture names for the occasion, which a native could hardly recognise.

Mr. Mackay's introduction begins with the remark, "It has been matter of complaint that the history of the natural productions of Ireland has hitherto been neglected," but he considers the censure as one of too great severity. The authoress of an "Irish Flora," published about three years before Mr. Mackay's, viz. in 1833, says, "it has been remarked, that when England and France had their provincial Floras, the botany of this island was as much unknown as that of an island in the Pacific; although its peasantry possessed a very considerable knowledge of plants, which is, &c.—but among its enlightened inhabitants it has remained almost a sealed book, while men of science have been occupied investigating other countries not possessing half its richness in vegetable productions." As a proof, the extraordinary deficiency of information in this science, to be met with in the surveys of counties in Ireland, is brought forward, with some exceptions; and be it remarked, that the works excepted were *published*, or at least some of them, before 1750; i. e. eighty years before the time of making the remark. A reviewer of Mr. Mackay's work in the Dublin University Magazine, in a very

interesting article, which proves the information and ability of the writer, except that he knew little of the past state of Ireland, renews the complaint of the *neglect* of the natural history of Ireland, speaks of everything relating to it as only just *beginning*, and compares this with the state of things in Bavaria and Sweden, and then with America. He speaks of the demand for general treatises and the publication of local Floras in England; adding, that "no local Flora has ever been *attempted* in Ireland." Speaking of the progress of the science, he adds, "the valuable result of all is had in England; and among the Scotch almost every town of any magnitude has its museum or botanic garden, or both, and it is but a few years since the only similar establishments in Ireland were those of Dublin—recently the spirited people of Belfast has established both a museum and botanic garden. When Cork or Limerick will choose to follow, where they did not know how to take the lead, we know not." There are not many who are able to detect the errors here fallen into, and which have been of late often repeated, because the greater part of the readers are, like the writer, ignorant of the past; and of what great consequence is it, some may think, if the efforts of earlier times be forgotten? Now as science is progressive, every succeeding period derives advantage from that going before. "No effort is lost," and it becomes those who are now making rapid advances, to acknowledge the advantages they derive from what their predecessors have done; and such is the *general* feeling, though we occasionally meet with departures from it, arising perhaps more from the ignorance of the writer than from any desire to deprive the dead of any credit to which they were entitled. According to the reviewer no previous publication existed from which Mr. Mackay could obtain any great amount of information respecting our indigenous plants. "The only original work to which he could refer was that of Threlkeld, published more than a century ago, and which is unfortunately merely a catalogue of the more common plants alphabetically arranged, with brief indication of their real or supposed medical virtues. The work of K'Eogh is scarcely deserving of notice, and with one or two exceptions no botanical information was to be obtained from the statistical surveys of the different counties. The task of ascertaining the habitats of rare plants and of discovering new ones, rested almost entirely with the author and his contemporaries." Now somewhat depends on the meaning annexed to contemporaries; and if it includes all who were living at the same time, even those who were going off the stage when Mr. M. came on it, it would include a great many whose principal services to bo-

interesting article, which proves the information and ability of the writer, except that he knew little of the past state of Ireland, renews the complaint of the *neglect* of the natural history of Ireland, speaks of everything relating to it as only just *beginning*, and compares this with the state of things in Bavaria and Sweden, and then with America. He speaks of the demand for general treatises and the publication of local Floras in England; adding, that "no local Flora has ever been *attempted* in Ireland." Speaking of the progress of the science, he adds, "the valuable result of all is had in England; and among the Scotch almost every town of any magnitude has its museum or botanic garden, or both, and it is but a few years since the only similar establishments in Ireland were those of Dublin—recently the spirited people of Belfast has established both a museum and botanic garden. When Cork or Limerick will choose to follow, where they did not know how to take the lead, we know not." There are not many who are able to detect the errors here fallen into, and which have been of late often repeated, because the greater part of the readers are, like the writer, ignorant of the past; and of what great consequence is it, some may think, if the efforts of earlier times be forgotten? Now as science is progressive, every succeeding period derives advantage from that going before. "No effort is lost," and it becomes those who are now making rapid advances, to acknowledge the advantages they derive from what their predecessors have done; and such is the *general* feeling, though we occasionally meet with departures from it, arising perhaps more from the ignorance of the writer than from any desire to deprive the dead of any credit to which they were entitled. According to the reviewer no previous publication existed from which Mr. Mackay could obtain any great amount of information respecting our indigenous plants. "The only original work to which he could refer was that of Threlkeld, published more than a century ago, and which is unfortunately merely a catalogue of the more common plants alphabetically arranged, with brief indication of their real or supposed medical virtues. The work of K'Eogh is scarcely deserving of notice, and with one or two exceptions no botanical information was to be obtained from the statistical surveys of the different counties. The task of ascertaining the habitats of rare plants and of discovering new ones, rested almost entirely with the author and his contemporaries." Now somewhat depends on the meaning annexed to contemporaries; and if it includes all who were living at the same time, even those who were going off the stage when Mr. M. came on it, it would include a great many whose principal services to bo-

interesting article, which proves the information and ability of the writer, except that he knew little of the past state of Ireland, renews the complaint of the *neglect* of the natural history of Ireland, speaks of everything relating to it as only just *beginning*, and compares this with the state of things in Bavaria and Sweden, and then with America. He speaks of the demand for general treatises and the publication of local Floras in England; adding, that "no local Flora has ever been *attempted* in Ireland." Speaking of the progress of the science, he adds, "the valuable result of all is had in England; and among the Scotch almost every town of any magnitude has its museum or botanic garden, or both, and it is but a few years since the only similar establishments in Ireland were those of Dublin—recently the spirited people of Belfast has established both a museum and botanic garden. When Cork or Limerick will choose to follow, where they did not know how to take the lead, we know not." There are not many who are able to detect the errors here fallen into, and which have been of late often repeated, because the greater part of the readers are, like the writer, ignorant of the past; and of what great consequence is it, some may think, if the efforts of earlier times be forgotten? Now as science is progressive, every succeeding period derives advantage from that going before. "No effort is lost," and it becomes those who are now making rapid advances, to acknowledge the advantages they derive from what their predecessors have done; and such is the *general* feeling, though we occasionally meet with departures from it, arising perhaps more from the ignorance of the writer than from any desire to deprive the dead of any credit to which they were entitled. According to the reviewer no previous publication existed from which Mr. Mackay could obtain any great amount of information respecting our indigenous plants. "The only original work to which he could refer was that of Threlkeld, published more than a century ago, and which is unfortunately merely a catalogue of the more common plants alphabetically arranged, with brief indication of their real or supposed medical virtues. The work of K'Eogh is scarcely deserving of notice, and with one or two exceptions no botanical information was to be obtained from the statistical surveys of the different counties. The task of ascertaining the habitats of rare plants and of discovering new ones, rested almost entirely with the author and his contemporaries." Now somewhat depends on the meaning annexed to contemporaries; and if it includes all who were living at the same time, even those who were going off the stage when Mr. M. came on it, it would include a great many whose principal services to bo-

tany were previous to Mr. Mackay's settlement in Ireland, and were in a great degree a cause of that settlement, to whom I shall afterwards refer. I am willing to take it in that extensive sense, and trust I shall make it appear that Mr. Mackay found much done by them before he saw Ireland. But does not Mr. Mackay in his preface tell us of Molyneux's catalogue of *rare* plants appended to Threlkeld? and previously of Heaton, and Llhwyd and Sherard? Are not some of our rarest plants recorded by Ray? Does not he tell us of Smith's Cork and Kerry? of Wade's Flora Dublinensis and Plantæ Rariores? Does he not refer to a catalogue of the plants of the county Cork by Jas. Drummond? These are mentioned by Mr. Mackay, but considered by his reviewer as absolutely nothing.

Having thus stated the charge brought, that the literary men of Ireland had been peculiarly negligent of her botanical treasures, I shall endeavour to show that it is in great measure not well-founded. It proceeds on the supposition that because a local Flora had not been published, therefore "the botany of Ireland was as much unknown as that of an island in the Pacific." Now we have seen that works were published early in the 18th century, and that references are made to botanists in the 17th century: may we not then look to the comparative state of botany elsewhere? It is well known that for a long period this science was cultivated merely as "the humble but engaging handmaid of surgery and medicine." All the catalogues had a reference to this, except those of timber trees and articles of food. It was not till the latter end of the 17th century, that botany began to make progress as a science, and notwithstanding the valuable labours of Ray and Tournefort, it was not till the establishment of the Linnæan System, about the middle of the 18th century, that there was any work "to enable a botanist by short determinate characters to discover the name of an unknown plant." It is useless then to lament that there was no *Irish* work of this kind, when none existed anywhere. Without urging our ignorance of what may be concealed in Irish MSS; without alleging the change that had so recently taken place in Ireland by the cutting down of woods and the formation of bogs; without dwelling on its wretched internal state, so adverse to all scientific inquiries; it is enough to state that there was a like ignorance of plants in other countries, and that the idea of distinct Floras as guides to students had not been conceived. The earliest works in Ireland, as in England, were chiefly intended to guide the medical practitioner, "the culler of simples," where to find what he wanted. It was not till 1762, when

tany were previous to Mr. Mackay's settlement in Ireland, and were in a great degree a cause of that settlement, to whom I shall afterwards refer. I am willing to take it in that extensive sense, and trust I shall make it appear that Mr. Mackay found much done by them before he saw Ireland. But does not Mr. Mackay in his preface tell us of Molyneux's catalogue of *rare* plants appended to Threlkeld? and previously of Heaton, and Llhwyd and Sherard? Are not some of our rarest plants recorded by Ray? Does not he tell us of Smith's Cork and Kerry? of Wade's Flora Dublinensis and Plantæ Rariores? Does he not refer to a catalogue of the plants of the county Cork by Jas. Drummond? These are mentioned by Mr. Mackay, but considered by his reviewer as absolutely nothing.

Having thus stated the charge brought, that the literary men of Ireland had been peculiarly negligent of her botanical treasures, I shall endeavour to show that it is in great measure not well-founded. It proceeds on the supposition that because a local Flora had not been published, therefore "the botany of Ireland was as much unknown as that of an island in the Pacific." Now we have seen that works were published early in the 18th century, and that references are made to botanists in the 17th century: may we not then look to the comparative state of botany elsewhere? It is well known that for a long period this science was cultivated merely as "the humble but engaging handmaid of surgery and medicine." All the catalogues had a reference to this, except those of timber trees and articles of food. It was not till the latter end of the 17th century, that botany began to make progress as a science, and notwithstanding the valuable labours of Ray and Tournefort, it was not till the establishment of the Linnæan System, about the middle of the 18th century, that there was any work "to enable a botanist by short determinate characters to discover the name of an unknown plant." It is useless then to lament that there was no *Irish* work of this kind, when none existed anywhere. Without urging our ignorance of what may be concealed in Irish MSS; without alleging the change that had so recently taken place in Ireland by the cutting down of woods and the formation of bogs; without dwelling on its wretched internal state, so adverse to all scientific inquiries; it is enough to state that there was a like ignorance of plants in other countries, and that the idea of distinct Floras as guides to students had not been conceived. The earliest works in Ireland, as in England, were chiefly intended to guide the medical practitioner, "the culler of simples," where to find what he wanted. It was not till 1762, when

tany were previous to Mr. Mackay's settlement in Ireland, and were in a great degree a cause of that settlement, to whom I shall afterwards refer. I am willing to take it in that extensive sense, and trust I shall make it appear that Mr. Mackay found much done by them before he saw Ireland. But does not Mr. Mackay in his preface tell us of Molyneux's catalogue of *rare* plants appended to Threlkeld? and previously of Heaton, and Llhwyd and Sherard? Are not some of our rarest plants recorded by Ray? Does not he tell us of Smith's Cork and Kerry? of Wade's Flora Dublinensis and Plantæ Rariores? Does he not refer to a catalogue of the plants of the county Cork by Jas. Drummond? These are mentioned by Mr. Mackay, but considered by his reviewer as absolutely nothing.

Having thus stated the charge brought, that the literary men of Ireland had been peculiarly negligent of her botanical treasures, I shall endeavour to show that it is in great measure not well-founded. It proceeds on the supposition that because a local Flora had not been published, therefore "the botany of Ireland was as much unknown as that of an island in the Pacific." Now we have seen that works were published early in the 18th century, and that references are made to botanists in the 17th century: may we not then look to the comparative state of botany elsewhere? It is well known that for a long period this science was cultivated merely as "the humble but engaging handmaid of surgery and medicine." All the catalogues had a reference to this, except those of timber trees and articles of food. It was not till the latter end of the 17th century, that botany began to make progress as a science, and notwithstanding the valuable labours of Ray and Tournefort, it was not till the establishment of the Linnæan System, about the middle of the 18th century, that there was any work "to enable a botanist by short determinate characters to discover the name of an unknown plant." It is useless then to lament that there was no *Irish* work of this kind, when none existed anywhere. Without urging our ignorance of what may be concealed in Irish MSS; without alleging the change that had so recently taken place in Ireland by the cutting down of woods and the formation of bogs; without dwelling on its wretched internal state, so adverse to all scientific inquiries; it is enough to state that there was a like ignorance of plants in other countries, and that the idea of distinct Floras as guides to students had not been conceived. The earliest works in Ireland, as in England, were chiefly intended to guide the medical practitioner, "the culler of simples," where to find what he wanted. It was not till 1762, when

Hudson published his *Flora Anglica*, that British botanists had a systematic manual, but are we therefore to regard the works of preceding botanists as useless? An improved edition appeared in 1778, and Lightfoot's *Flora Scotica*, the first respecting the peculiar botany of Scotland which I have yet traced, appeared in 1777, the work, be it recollected, of an Englishman, at the instigation and even the expense of a native of Wales, Mr. Pennant. From this time the progress of the science was rapid; in 1786 Dr. Withering published his "Botanical Arrangement" in English, and shortly before or soon after commenced Curtis's *Flora Londinensis* and *Botanical Magazine*, Smith and Sowerby's *English Botany* (including Scotland and Ireland), and the *Transactions of the Linnæan Society*. Previous to 1780 botany could have made little progress in Great Britain, except amongst scientific men, though the dawn of a brighter day of botanical science may be observed in the records of the period immediately preceding. My business however is with Ireland; and I shall first inquire what had been done towards a botanical knowledge of that country previous to 1780; and then whether it accompanied England in its advance, or by unaccountable and shameful neglect, left all to be done, and *by strangers*, within the last few years.

We have no records of the first discoverers, but we know that a Rev. Mr. Heaton communicated the names of plants he had found to How and Merret, and that, probably through him, those plants which at present constitute the most remarkable difference of the *Flora of this island* from that of Great Britain, were known and recorded long before the time of Threlkeld. In 1727 appeared the first list of Irish plants, except what may possibly exist in the Irish language. I will not repeat the slighting terms in which this work is spoken of, but by giving a fuller account of his work, show that the distinguished Robert Brown did not estimate the author of it too highly when he thought him deserving of a place amongst the promoters of botanical knowledge. I allude to the circumstance of his having called a genus of plants by his name, which he would hardly have done if he considered his work so useless as some regard it. The title was "*Synopsis Stirpium Hibernicarum, &c. &c.*", being a short treatise of native plants, especially such as grow spontaneously in the vicinity of Dublin, with their Latin, English, and Irish names, and an abridgement of their virtues, with several new discoveries; with an appendix of observations made upon plants by Dr. Molyneux, Physician to the State in Ireland." The modest motto prefixed is, "*Est quiddam prodire tenus si non detur*

Hudson published his *Flora Anglica*, that British botanists had a systematic manual, but are we therefore to regard the works of preceding botanists as useless? An improved edition appeared in 1778, and Lightfoot's *Flora Scotica*, the first respecting the peculiar botany of Scotland which I have yet traced, appeared in 1777, the work, be it recollected, of an Englishman, at the instigation and even the expense of a native of Wales, Mr. Pennant. From this time the progress of the science was rapid; in 1786 Dr. Withering published his "Botanical Arrangement" in English, and shortly before or soon after commenced Curtis's *Flora Londinensis* and *Botanical Magazine*, Smith and Sowerby's *English Botany* (including Scotland and Ireland), and the *Transactions of the Linnæan Society*. Previous to 1780 botany could have made little progress in Great Britain, except amongst scientific men, though the dawn of a brighter day of botanical science may be observed in the records of the period immediately preceding. My business however is with Ireland; and I shall first inquire what had been done towards a botanical knowledge of that country previous to 1780; and then whether it accompanied England in its advance, or by unaccountable and shameful neglect, left all to be done, and *by strangers*, within the last few years.

We have no records of the first discoverers, but we know that a Rev. Mr. Heaton communicated the names of plants he had found to How and Merret, and that, probably through him, those plants which at present constitute the most remarkable difference of the *Flora of this island* from that of Great Britain, were known and recorded long before the time of Threlkeld. In 1727 appeared the first list of Irish plants, except what may possibly exist in the Irish language. I will not repeat the slighting terms in which this work is spoken of, but by giving a fuller account of his work, show that the distinguished Robert Brown did not estimate the author of it too highly when he thought him deserving of a place amongst the promoters of botanical knowledge. I allude to the circumstance of his having called a genus of plants by his name, which he would hardly have done if he considered his work so useless as some regard it. The title was "*Synopsis Stirpium Hibernicarum, &c. &c.*", being a short treatise of native plants, especially such as grow spontaneously in the vicinity of Dublin, with their Latin, English, and Irish names, and an abridgement of their virtues, with several new discoveries; with an appendix of observations made upon plants by Dr. Molyneux, Physician to the State in Ireland." The modest motto prefixed is, "*Est quiddam prodire tenus si non detur*

Hudson published his *Flora Anglica*, that British botanists had a systematic manual, but are we therefore to regard the works of preceding botanists as useless? An improved edition appeared in 1778, and Lightfoot's *Flora Scotica*, the first respecting the peculiar botany of Scotland which I have yet traced, appeared in 1777, the work, be it recollected, of an Englishman, at the instigation and even the expense of a native of Wales, Mr. Pennant. From this time the progress of the science was rapid; in 1786 Dr. Withering published his "Botanical Arrangement" in English, and shortly before or soon after commenced Curtis's *Flora Londinensis* and *Botanical Magazine*, Smith and Sowerby's *English Botany* (including Scotland and Ireland), and the *Transactions of the Linnæan Society*. Previous to 1780 botany could have made little progress in Great Britain, except amongst scientific men, though the dawn of a brighter day of botanical science may be observed in the records of the period immediately preceding. My business however is with Ireland; and I shall first inquire what had been done towards a botanical knowledge of that country previous to 1780; and then whether it accompanied England in its advance, or by unaccountable and shameful neglect, left all to be done, and *by strangers*, within the last few years.

We have no records of the first discoverers, but we know that a Rev. Mr. Heaton communicated the names of plants he had found to How and Merret, and that, probably through him, those plants which at present constitute the most remarkable difference of the *Flora of this island* from that of Great Britain, were known and recorded long before the time of Threlkeld. In 1727 appeared the first list of Irish plants, except what may possibly exist in the Irish language. I will not repeat the slighting terms in which this work is spoken of, but by giving a fuller account of his work, show that the distinguished Robert Brown did not estimate the author of it too highly when he thought him deserving of a place amongst the promoters of botanical knowledge. I allude to the circumstance of his having called a genus of plants by his name, which he would hardly have done if he considered his work so useless as some regard it. The title was "*Synopsis Stirpium Hibernicarum, &c. &c.*", being a short treatise of native plants, especially such as grow spontaneously in the vicinity of Dublin, with their Latin, English, and Irish names, and an abridgement of their virtues, with several new discoveries; with an appendix of observations made upon plants by Dr. Molyneux, Physician to the State in Ireland." The modest motto prefixed is, "*Est quiddam prodire tenus si non detur*

ultra." The work was dedicated to Primate Boulter. Threlkeld was an Englishman, who settled in Dublin as a physician and dissenting minister. In his preface he speaks of having devoted attention to botanical studies in England as well as since he came to Ireland, and particularly mentions his having been in danger in 1707 (twenty years before the publication of this work) in the neighbourhood of Tynemouth Castle, from having been observed clambering on rocks instead of keeping the high road. He expressly says too, that he collected plants for twelve years, marking the place where they grew, and preserving them in a Hortus siccus, whereas the author of the article *THRELKELDIA* in Rees's Cyclopædia (did Sir J. E. Smith continue his contributions so long?) says, "that this catalogue was founded on the papers of Dr. Thos. Molyneux, or the communications of other people," and seems to question the propriety of Mr. Brown's notice of him. Rank in science he neither claimed himself, nor have others done it for him; but so far is the preceding charge from being just, that Dr. Molyneux's contributions, having come too late to be incorporated with the work, were printed as an Appendix, and he appears to have expressly noticed every plant that was inserted in his catalogue on the authority of others. Threlkeld speaks of his work as a *pocket-book, a small treatise, an abridgement*, by which he hopes to stir up others to contribute their quota "to wipe off the ugly character Pomponius Mela has fixed on the Irish inhabitants, *cultores ejus inconditos esse, et omnium virtutum ignaros magis quam alias gentes.*" Yet he himself in the same preface gives a fair excuse for the neglect of this branch of learning, when he observes, "that the wars and commotions have laid an embargo upon the pens of the learned, or discord among the petty subaltern princes has rendered perambulation perilous, least they should be treated as spies," when he mentions his own danger at Tynemouth in 1707. In the days of Threlkeld botany was little more than a branch of medicine, and in this light he chiefly regarded it. To detail the virtues of plants was his grand object, and he satisfies himself with the names by which they could be found in the works of Gerard, Caspar Bauhin and Ray, who appear to have been his authorities, though he sometimes expresses himself peevishly of the changes made by the last, which in his eyes were not improvements. To their Latin name he adds the English one and the Irish one, when he could attain it. These "Irish names," he says, "I copied from a manuscript which has great authority with me, and seems to have been written sometime before the civil wars in 1641, and probably by that Reverend

ultra." The work was dedicated to Primate Boulter. Threlkeld was an Englishman, who settled in Dublin as a physician and dissenting minister. In his preface he speaks of having devoted attention to botanical studies in England as well as since he came to Ireland, and particularly mentions his having been in danger in 1707 (twenty years before the publication of this work) in the neighbourhood of Tynemouth Castle, from having been observed clambering on rocks instead of keeping the high road. He expressly says too, that he collected plants for twelve years, marking the place where they grew, and preserving them in a Hortus siccus, whereas the author of the article *THRELKELDIA* in Rees's Cyclopædia (did Sir J. E. Smith continue his contributions so long?) says, "that this catalogue was founded on the papers of Dr. Thos. Molyneux, or the communications of other people," and seems to question the propriety of Mr. Brown's notice of him. Rank in science he neither claimed himself, nor have others done it for him; but so far is the preceding charge from being just, that Dr. Molyneux's contributions, having come too late to be incorporated with the work, were printed as an Appendix, and he appears to have expressly noticed every plant that was inserted in his catalogue on the authority of others. Threlkeld speaks of his work as a *pocket-book, a small treatise, an abridgement*, by which he hopes to stir up others to contribute their quota "to wipe off the ugly character Pomponius Mela has fixed on the Irish inhabitants, *cultores ejus inconditos esse, et omnium virtutum ignaros magis quam alias gentes.*" Yet he himself in the same preface gives a fair excuse for the neglect of this branch of learning, when he observes, "that the wars and commotions have laid an embargo upon the pens of the learned, or discord among the petty subaltern princes has rendered perambulation perilous, least they should be treated as spies," when he mentions his own danger at Tynemouth in 1707. In the days of Threlkeld botany was little more than a branch of medicine, and in this light he chiefly regarded it. To detail the virtues of plants was his grand object, and he satisfies himself with the names by which they could be found in the works of Gerard, Caspar Bauhin and Ray, who appear to have been his authorities, though he sometimes expresses himself peevishly of the changes made by the last, which in his eyes were not improvements. To their Latin name he adds the English one and the Irish one, when he could attain it. These "Irish names," he says, "I copied from a manuscript which has great authority with me, and seems to have been written sometime before the civil wars in 1641, and probably by that Reverend

ultra." The work was dedicated to Primate Boulter. Threlkeld was an Englishman, who settled in Dublin as a physician and dissenting minister. In his preface he speaks of having devoted attention to botanical studies in England as well as since he came to Ireland, and particularly mentions his having been in danger in 1707 (twenty years before the publication of this work) in the neighbourhood of Tynemouth Castle, from having been observed clambering on rocks instead of keeping the high road. He expressly says too, that he collected plants for twelve years, marking the place where they grew, and preserving them in a Hortus siccus, whereas the author of the article *THRELKELDIA* in Rees's Cyclopædia (did Sir J. E. Smith continue his contributions so long?) says, "that this catalogue was founded on the papers of Dr. Thos. Molyneux, or the communications of other people," and seems to question the propriety of Mr. Brown's notice of him. Rank in science he neither claimed himself, nor have others done it for him; but so far is the preceding charge from being just, that Dr. Molyneux's contributions, having come too late to be incorporated with the work, were printed as an Appendix, and he appears to have expressly noticed every plant that was inserted in his catalogue on the authority of others. Threlkeld speaks of his work as a *pocket-book, a small treatise, an abridgement*, by which he hopes to stir up others to contribute their quota "to wipe off the ugly character Pomponius Mela has fixed on the Irish inhabitants, *cultores ejus inconditos esse, et omnium virtutum ignaros magis quam alias gentes.*" Yet he himself in the same preface gives a fair excuse for the neglect of this branch of learning, when he observes, "that the wars and commotions have laid an embargo upon the pens of the learned, or discord among the petty subaltern princes has rendered perambulation perilous, least they should be treated as spies," when he mentions his own danger at Tynemouth in 1707. In the days of Threlkeld botany was little more than a branch of medicine, and in this light he chiefly regarded it. To detail the virtues of plants was his grand object, and he satisfies himself with the names by which they could be found in the works of Gerard, Caspar Bauhin and Ray, who appear to have been his authorities, though he sometimes expresses himself peevishly of the changes made by the last, which in his eyes were not improvements. To their Latin name he adds the English one and the Irish one, when he could attain it. These "Irish names," he says, "I copied from a manuscript which has great authority with me, and seems to have been written sometime before the civil wars in 1641, and probably by that Reverend

Irish Divine Mr. Heaton, who is quoted by Dr. How in the *Phytologia Britannica* for several plants, and also by Dr. Merret. He could find no living person acquainted with so many, and whether K'Eogh also made use of the same MS. or not, I have found their Irish names generally to agree. The number of species enumerated by Threlkeld (exclusive of all Cryptogamous plants, except the Fern tribe), was 473. Mackay's species in 1836 were 1054, and those of England 1436. When amongst those of Threlkeld we find *Arbutus Unedo*, *Dryas octopetala*, *Menziesia polifolia*, *Euphorbia Hiberna*, *Saxifraga umbrosa*, *Epipactis ensifolia*, *Osmunda regalis*, *Asplenium viride*, and other rare plants, some peculiar to Ireland, can we fairly say of such a country, that "its botany was as much unknown as that of an island in the Pacific"? May we not rather say that this collection made by Threlkeld, of plants observed by himself or by his predecessors, was a respectable foundation for future botanists to build upon? and that it should be estimated not by the knowledge of the present day, but by that of the period before the introduction of the Linnæan system? Amongst those whose discoveries were previous to Threlkeld's work, were Llhwyd and Sherard. Sherard's visit, as far as I can ascertain, was in 1695 or 1696, before he went abroad with Lord Howland afterwards Duke of Bedford; and he spent part of his time at Moira, not far from Lough Neagh, with Sir Arthur Rawdon. Amongst his discoveries were *Subularia aquatica*, *Epipactis grandiflora*, *Lithospermum maritimum*, *Drosera longifolia* (previously by Mr. Heaton), *Andromeda polifolia*, and probably others I have not noticed. The Murrough of Wicklow is given by Mr. Mackay as one of the habitats of *Lithospermum maritimum*, where it grows plentifully; and this is the habitat given by Sherard. Now is it not interesting to know, that nearly a century and a half before Mr. Mackay's work this habitat was known? True, the designations of the plants are not such as to lead a Linnæan botanist to recognise them without some labour; and the alphabetical arrangement is bad, though perhaps not much worse than if the author had adopted Gerard's, C. Bauhin's, or even Ray's arrangement; and I cannot help regretting that Mr. Mackay did not consider it an object to study Threlkeld's work, and make it the foundation of his labours. The appendix was supplied by Dr. Thomas Molyneux, the brother of Locke's distinguished friend, and a man more known for his exertions to promote science in Ireland than for the honour of a baronetage, still enjoyed by his descendant. This Appendix contains a more bare list of the plants found than Threlkeld's own, and a few are thus given

Irish Divine Mr. Heaton, who is quoted by Dr. How in the *Phytologia Britannica* for several plants, and also by Dr. Merret. He could find no living person acquainted with so many, and whether K'Eogh also made use of the same MS. or not, I have found their Irish names generally to agree. The number of species enumerated by Threlkeld (exclusive of all Cryptogamous plants, except the Fern tribe), was 473. Mackay's species in 1836 were 1054, and those of England 1436. When amongst those of Threlkeld we find *Arbutus Unedo*, *Dryas octopetala*, *Menziesia polifolia*, *Euphorbia Hiberna*, *Saxifraga umbrosa*, *Epipactis ensifolia*, *Osmunda regalis*, *Asplenium viride*, and other rare plants, some peculiar to Ireland, can we fairly say of such a country, that "its botany was as much unknown as that of an island in the Pacific"? May we not rather say that this collection made by Threlkeld, of plants observed by himself or by his predecessors, was a respectable foundation for future botanists to build upon? and that it should be estimated not by the knowledge of the present day, but by that of the period before the introduction of the Linnæan system? Amongst those whose discoveries were previous to Threlkeld's work, were Llhwyd and Sherard. Sherard's visit, as far as I can ascertain, was in 1695 or 1696, before he went abroad with Lord Howland afterwards Duke of Bedford; and he spent part of his time at Moira, not far from Lough Neagh, with Sir Arthur Rawdon. Amongst his discoveries were *Subularia aquatica*, *Epipactis grandiflora*, *Lithospermum maritimum*, *Drosera longifolia* (previously by Mr. Heaton), *Andromeda polifolia*, and probably others I have not noticed. The Murrough of Wicklow is given by Mr. Mackay as one of the habitats of *Lithospermum maritimum*, where it grows plentifully; and this is the habitat given by Sherard. Now is it not interesting to know, that nearly a century and a half before Mr. Mackay's work this habitat was known? True, the designations of the plants are not such as to lead a Linnæan botanist to recognise them without some labour; and the alphabetical arrangement is bad, though perhaps not much worse than if the author had adopted Gerard's, C. Bauhin's, or even Ray's arrangement; and I cannot help regretting that Mr. Mackay did not consider it an object to study Threlkeld's work, and make it the foundation of his labours. The appendix was supplied by Dr. Thomas Molyneux, the brother of Locke's distinguished friend, and a man more known for his exertions to promote science in Ireland than for the honour of a baronetage, still enjoyed by his descendant. This Appendix contains a more bare list of the plants found than Threlkeld's own, and a few are thus given

Irish Divine Mr. Heaton, who is quoted by Dr. How in the *Phytologia Britannica* for several plants, and also by Dr. Merret. He could find no living person acquainted with so many, and whether K'Eogh also made use of the same MS. or not, I have found their Irish names generally to agree. The number of species enumerated by Threlkeld (exclusive of all Cryptogamous plants, except the Fern tribe), was 473. Mackay's species in 1836 were 1054, and those of England 1436. When amongst those of Threlkeld we find *Arbutus Unedo*, *Dryas octopetala*, *Menziesia polifolia*, *Euphorbia Hiberna*, *Saxifraga umbrosa*, *Epipactis ensifolia*, *Osmunda regalis*, *Asplenium viride*, and other rare plants, some peculiar to Ireland, can we fairly say of such a country, that "its botany was as much unknown as that of an island in the Pacific"? May we not rather say that this collection made by Threlkeld, of plants observed by himself or by his predecessors, was a respectable foundation for future botanists to build upon? and that it should be estimated not by the knowledge of the present day, but by that of the period before the introduction of the Linnæan system? Amongst those whose discoveries were previous to Threlkeld's work, were Llhwyd and Sherard. Sherard's visit, as far as I can ascertain, was in 1695 or 1696, before he went abroad with Lord Howland afterwards Duke of Bedford; and he spent part of his time at Moira, not far from Lough Neagh, with Sir Arthur Rawdon. Amongst his discoveries were *Subularia aquatica*, *Epipactis grandiflora*, *Lithospermum maritimum*, *Drosera longifolia* (previously by Mr. Heaton), *Andromeda polifolia*, and probably others I have not noticed. The Murrough of Wicklow is given by Mr. Mackay as one of the habitats of *Lithospermum maritimum*, where it grows plentifully; and this is the habitat given by Sherard. Now is it not interesting to know, that nearly a century and a half before Mr. Mackay's work this habitat was known? True, the designations of the plants are not such as to lead a Linnæan botanist to recognise them without some labour; and the alphabetical arrangement is bad, though perhaps not much worse than if the author had adopted Gerard's, C. Bauhin's, or even Ray's arrangement; and I cannot help regretting that Mr. Mackay did not consider it an object to study Threlkeld's work, and make it the foundation of his labours. The appendix was supplied by Dr. Thomas Molyneux, the brother of Locke's distinguished friend, and a man more known for his exertions to promote science in Ireland than for the honour of a baronetage, still enjoyed by his descendant. This Appendix contains a more bare list of the plants found than Threlkeld's own, and a few are thus given

a second time and even under a different name; yet still it is a valuable record, and deserving the attention of the Irish botanist. Another old work often referred to, is the *Botanologia Universalis Hibernica*, or a "General Irish Herbal," by Mr. K'Eogh, published in 1735. This gentleman was a clergyman, chaplain to Lord Kingston, and seems to have resided near Mitchelstown, the seat of that nobleman in the county Cork, to plants in whose garden he often refers. The garden of that nobleman's descendant, the present Earl of Kingston, is perhaps the finest in Ireland; and there is attached to it, for the use of the gardeners, a library of valuable botanical works, many of them very expensive, under the superintendence of the head gardener. Mr. K'Eogh also often refers to the Barony of Burren, in the county Clare, from which, I think it probable that he was a native of that county. His names are nearly the same as those of Threlkeld, his publication having taken place within eight years after. To notice the medical virtues of plants was his great aim, and this is done with respect to cultivated plants as well as wild ones; but he states when got in gardens and when found wild, so that the work is not without its use in ascertaining the native plants then known. His botanical knowledge, however, may not have been such as to justify the insertion of plants merely on his authority, though it might direct attention to look for them in the district pointed out. *Galega officinalis*, *Asclepias* or *Swallowwort* (species not mentioned), *Palma Christi* or the *Greater Spurge*, and others, are said to be wild in Burren. It is so unlikely that this should be so, that it throws a doubt on his authority; but if the district were well examined, it might be found that other plants were taken for them, which an indifferent botanist in the then rude state of the science might mistake for them, as I have little doubt that the *Ruta sylvestris*, *wild rue*, also said to be found there, was a *Thalictrum*, as he has not noticed any of that genus; and *T. majus* and *minus* are said to be found in an adjoining county, and generally known as *Meadow-rue**. This was suggested to me by a remark of Mr. Templeton's, who, having seen it stated that savin grew wild on the Mourne Mountains, and having diligently searched for it in vain, thought that *Lycopodium alpinum*, *Savin-leaved Clubmoss*, which does grow there, and on other high mountains in Ireland, gave rise to the report. It is at once more candid and more probable to suppose that men mistake through

* My son, the Rev. W. Hincks, F.L.S., informs me that Cæsalpinus gave the names *Ruta sylvestris* and *Ruta sylvestris altera*, to *Thalictrum majus* and *minus*, which confirms my conjecture.

a second time and even under a different name; yet still it is a valuable record, and deserving the attention of the Irish botanist. Another old work often referred to, is the *Botanologia Universalis Hibernica*, or a "General Irish Herbal," by Mr. K'Eogh, published in 1735. This gentleman was a clergyman, chaplain to Lord Kingston, and seems to have resided near Mitchelstown, the seat of that nobleman in the county Cork, to plants in whose garden he often refers. The garden of that nobleman's descendant, the present Earl of Kingston, is perhaps the finest in Ireland; and there is attached to it, for the use of the gardeners, a library of valuable botanical works, many of them very expensive, under the superintendence of the head gardener. Mr. K'Eogh also often refers to the Barony of Burren, in the county Clare, from which, I think it probable that he was a native of that county. His names are nearly the same as those of Threlkeld, his publication having taken place within eight years after. To notice the medical virtues of plants was his great aim, and this is done with respect to cultivated plants as well as wild ones; but he states when got in gardens and when found wild, so that the work is not without its use in ascertaining the native plants then known. His botanical knowledge, however, may not have been such as to justify the insertion of plants merely on his authority, though it might direct attention to look for them in the district pointed out. *Galega officinalis*, *Asclepias* or *Swallowwort* (species not mentioned), *Palma Christi* or the *Greater Spurge*, and others, are said to be wild in Burren. It is so unlikely that this should be so, that it throws a doubt on his authority; but if the district were well examined, it might be found that other plants were taken for them, which an indifferent botanist in the then rude state of the science might mistake for them, as I have little doubt that the *Ruta sylvestris*, *wild rue*, also said to be found there, was a *Thalictrum*, as he has not noticed any of that genus; and *T. majus* and *minus* are said to be found in an adjoining county, and generally known as *Meadow-rue**. This was suggested to me by a remark of Mr. Templeton's, who, having seen it stated that savin grew wild on the Mourne Mountains, and having diligently searched for it in vain, thought that *Lycopodium alpinum*, *Savin-leaved Clubmoss*, which does grow there, and on other high mountains in Ireland, gave rise to the report. It is at once more candid and more probable to suppose that men mistake through

* My son, the Rev. W. Hincks, F.L.S., informs me that Cæsalpinus gave the names *Ruta sylvestris* and *Ruta sylvestris altera*, to *Thalictrum majus* and *minus*, which confirms my conjecture.

a second time and even under a different name; yet still it is a valuable record, and deserving the attention of the Irish botanist. Another old work often referred to, is the *Botanologia Universalis Hibernica*, or a "General Irish Herbal," by Mr. K'Eogh, published in 1735. This gentleman was a clergyman, chaplain to Lord Kingston, and seems to have resided near Mitchelstown, the seat of that nobleman in the county Cork, to plants in whose garden he often refers. The garden of that nobleman's descendant, the present Earl of Kingston, is perhaps the finest in Ireland; and there is attached to it, for the use of the gardeners, a library of valuable botanical works, many of them very expensive, under the superintendence of the head gardener. Mr. K'Eogh also often refers to the Barony of Burren, in the county Clare, from which, I think it probable that he was a native of that county. His names are nearly the same as those of Threlkeld, his publication having taken place within eight years after. To notice the medical virtues of plants was his great aim, and this is done with respect to cultivated plants as well as wild ones; but he states when got in gardens and when found wild, so that the work is not without its use in ascertaining the native plants then known. His botanical knowledge, however, may not have been such as to justify the insertion of plants merely on his authority, though it might direct attention to look for them in the district pointed out. *Galega officinalis*, *Asclepias* or *Swallowwort* (species not mentioned), *Palma Christi* or the *Greater Spurge*, and others, are said to be wild in Burren. It is so unlikely that this should be so, that it throws a doubt on his authority; but if the district were well examined, it might be found that other plants were taken for them, which an indifferent botanist in the then rude state of the science might mistake for them, as I have little doubt that the *Ruta sylvestris*, *wild rue*, also said to be found there, was a *Thalictrum*, as he has not noticed any of that genus; and *T. majus* and *minus* are said to be found in an adjoining county, and generally known as *Meadow-rue**. This was suggested to me by a remark of Mr. Templeton's, who, having seen it stated that savin grew wild on the Mourne Mountains, and having diligently searched for it in vain, thought that *Lycopodium alpinum*, *Savin-leaved Clubmoss*, which does grow there, and on other high mountains in Ireland, gave rise to the report. It is at once more candid and more probable to suppose that men mistake through

* My son, the Rev. W. Hincks, F.L.S., informs me that Cæsalpinus gave the names *Ruta sylvestris* and *Ruta sylvestris altera*, to *Thalictrum majus* and *minus*, which confirms my conjecture.

ignorance, than that they wantonly assert falsehoods. In judging of such works as those of Threlkeld and K'Eogh, we should consider them as abridgements of Gerard and his followers for medical purposes. No one now refers for descriptions to Parkinson, How, Merret, or even Ray, but these writers preserve to us the knowledge of their times, and for this purpose are referred to. In 1711 a Botanical Lectureship was established in Dublin College, to which a small physic garden was then or soon after annexed, in connexion with the medical school, but I have not traced any immediate benefit to the science derived from it. The Dublin Society, founded in 1731, by the attention it paid to agriculture and planting, both intimately connected with botany, indirectly contributed to its progress; but a society called the *PHYSICO-HISTORICAL*, about 1746, more directly contributed to our knowledge of the plants of Ireland by employing a botanist (name not recorded) to examine the county Down, the most important and interesting of the counties in Ulster, both on account of its varied surface and fertility, and its containing the Mourne Mountains. The list of plants collected by this person was submitted, I think, to Dr. Rutty of Dublin (esteemed a good naturalist for his time), and was published in the history of that county, attributed to Harris. The same Society sent Dr. Charles Smith to the south of Ireland, who published under their authority his histories of Waterford and Cork, and afterwards, the Society having terminated, that of Kerry, at his own risk. Mr. Mackay seems to have confounded these histories with the statistical accounts published under the auspices of the Dublin Society at a much later period; but he speaks of Dr. Smith's histories as possessing considerable accuracy with regard to the localities of plants, as he found during his botanical excursions through that part of the country. The next Irish publication on the subject was "Dr. Rutty's Natural History of the county of Dublin," in 1772, in which, though Mr. Lee had explained the Linnæan system in England in 1760, and Hudson had adopted it in the *Flora Anglica* in 1762, the old system was retained, which, considering the age of Dr. Rutty, and the length of time he had been collecting his materials amidst the avocations of a laborious profession, is not to be wondered at or censured. Whatever useful information it may contain, Rutty's work appeared to me less calculated to serve the purposes of an Irish Flora than that of Threlkeld. Previous to 1780, we had then lists of plants by Threlkeld, K'Eogh, and Rutty; of the rare plants of Down, by an unknown person, but under the direction of a

ignorance, than that they wantonly assert falsehoods. In judging of such works as those of Threlkeld and K'Eogh, we should consider them as abridgements of Gerard and his followers for medical purposes. No one now refers for descriptions to Parkinson, How, Merret, or even Ray, but these writers preserve to us the knowledge of their times, and for this purpose are referred to. In 1711 a Botanical Lectureship was established in Dublin College, to which a small physic garden was then or soon after annexed, in connexion with the medical school, but I have not traced any immediate benefit to the science derived from it. The Dublin Society, founded in 1731, by the attention it paid to agriculture and planting, both intimately connected with botany, indirectly contributed to its progress; but a society called the PHYSICO-HISTORICAL, about 1746, more directly contributed to our knowledge of the plants of Ireland by employing a botanist (name not recorded) to examine the county Down, the most important and interesting of the counties in Ulster, both on account of its varied surface and fertility, and its containing the Mourne Mountains. The list of plants collected by this person was submitted, I think, to Dr. Rutty of Dublin (esteemed a good naturalist for his time), and was published in the history of that county, attributed to Harris. The same Society sent Dr. Charles Smith to the south of Ireland, who published under their authority his histories of Waterford and Cork, and afterwards, the Society having terminated, that of Kerry, at his own risk. Mr. Mackay seems to have confounded these histories with the statistical accounts published under the auspices of the Dublin Society at a much later period; but he speaks of Dr. Smith's histories as possessing considerable accuracy with regard to the localities of plants, as he found during his botanical excursions through that part of the country. The next Irish publication on the subject was "Dr. Rutty's Natural History of the county of Dublin," in 1772, in which, though Mr. Lee had explained the Linnæan system in England in 1760, and Hudson had adopted it in the *Flora Anglica* in 1762, the old system was retained, which, considering the age of Dr. Rutty, and the length of time he had been collecting his materials amidst the avocations of a laborious profession, is not to be wondered at or censured. Whatever useful information it may contain, Rutty's work appeared to me less calculated to serve the purposes of an Irish Flora than that of Threlkeld. Previous to 1780, we had then lists of plants by Threlkeld, K'Eogh, and Rutty; of the rare plants of Down, by an unknown person, but under the direction of a

ignorance, than that they wantonly assert falsehoods. In judging of such works as those of Threlkeld and K'Eogh, we should consider them as abridgements of Gerard and his followers for medical purposes. No one now refers for descriptions to Parkinson, How, Merret, or even Ray, but these writers preserve to us the knowledge of their times, and for this purpose are referred to. In 1711 a Botanical Lectureship was established in Dublin College, to which a small physic garden was then or soon after annexed, in connexion with the medical school, but I have not traced any immediate benefit to the science derived from it. The Dublin Society, founded in 1731, by the attention it paid to agriculture and planting, both intimately connected with botany, indirectly contributed to its progress; but a society called the PHYSICO-HISTORICAL, about 1746, more directly contributed to our knowledge of the plants of Ireland by employing a botanist (name not recorded) to examine the county Down, the most important and interesting of the counties in Ulster, both on account of its varied surface and fertility, and its containing the Mourne Mountains. The list of plants collected by this person was submitted, I think, to Dr. Rutty of Dublin (esteemed a good naturalist for his time), and was published in the history of that county, attributed to Harris. The same Society sent Dr. Charles Smith to the south of Ireland, who published under their authority his histories of Waterford and Cork, and afterwards, the Society having terminated, that of Kerry, at his own risk. Mr. Mackay seems to have confounded these histories with the statistical accounts published under the auspices of the Dublin Society at a much later period; but he speaks of Dr. Smith's histories as possessing considerable accuracy with regard to the localities of plants, as he found during his botanical excursions through that part of the country. The next Irish publication on the subject was "Dr. Rutty's Natural History of the county of Dublin," in 1772, in which, though Mr. Lee had explained the Linnæan system in England in 1760, and Hudson had adopted it in the *Flora Anglica* in 1762, the old system was retained, which, considering the age of Dr. Rutty, and the length of time he had been collecting his materials amidst the avocations of a laborious profession, is not to be wondered at or censured. Whatever useful information it may contain, Rutty's work appeared to me less calculated to serve the purposes of an Irish Flora than that of Threlkeld. Previous to 1780, we had then lists of plants by Threlkeld, K'Eogh, and Rutty; of the rare plants of Down, by an unknown person, but under the direction of a

Society in Dublin; of the rare plants of Waterford, Cork, and Kerry, the three most southern counties, by Dr. Charles Smith, whose accuracy is admitted, and communications to the lists of How, Merret, and Ray, of the most remarkable plants that had yet been found in the country. We have now to inquire what progress was made in Ireland after 1780, and previous to Mr. Mackay's labours. In 1785, the Lectureship on Botany in the University was changed by Act of Parliament to a professorship, and annual courses of lectures were made imperative. Dr. Edward Hill, who had been lecturer, was the first professor, and continued to fill the chair till his death in 1801. I have not heard any character of his lectures, but it is reasonable to suppose that the increasing love of botany, which led to the change in the College, and to other circumstances, must have originated with him. Be this as it may, we find Dr. Robert Scott, who was afterwards his successor, Dr. Wade, Dr. Young, a fellow of Dublin College (afterwards bishop of Clonfert), an eminent promoter of science, Dr. Whitley Stokes, Fellow of Dublin College, and now Professor of Natural History in it, Mr. Blashford, a barrister, and others, adding every now and then new contributions to the Flora. At this time the late Mr. Templeton turned his attention to botany, and in 1793 had actually laid out that garden, known to all the botanists who have visited Belfast; that garden in which he made the interesting experiments on raising plants in the open air, previously found only in conservatories, communicated to the Royal Irish Academy in 1799; that garden which to this day is a monument of his zeal, his skill, and of that attachment to botany with which he inspired his family. In 1792, Dr. Brinkley came to Ireland as Professor of Astronomy, and he was an ardent botanist; Dr. Barker made out a list of the plants of his native county, Waterford, Mr. Tighe of those of Kilkenny; and the illustrious Robert Brown, being at Derry for some time previous to his going to New Holland, not only carefully examined that county, but extended his researches to the county of Donegal. All the gentlemen whose names I have mentioned were in communication with Mr. Templeton, and he was urged by most of them to undertake the Flora of Ireland, with a promise of assistance. In the meantime Dr. Wade published his Flora of the county Dublin in 1794. About the year 1800 the Dublin Society established a professorship of botany, which was filled by Dr. Wade, and began the Glasnevin garden, having Mr. Underwood for their first gardener. The parliamentary grant for this purpose was procured chiefly by the

Society in Dublin; of the rare plants of Waterford, Cork, and Kerry, the three most southern counties, by Dr. Charles Smith, whose accuracy is admitted, and communications to the lists of How, Merret, and Ray, of the most remarkable plants that had yet been found in the country. We have now to inquire what progress was made in Ireland after 1780, and previous to Mr. Mackay's labours. In 1785, the Lectureship on Botany in the University was changed by Act of Parliament to a professorship, and annual courses of lectures were made imperative. Dr. Edward Hill, who had been lecturer, was the first professor, and continued to fill the chair till his death in 1801. I have not heard any character of his lectures, but it is reasonable to suppose that the increasing love of botany, which led to the change in the College, and to other circumstances, must have originated with him. Be this as it may, we find Dr. Robert Scott, who was afterwards his successor, Dr. Wade, Dr. Young, a fellow of Dublin College (afterwards bishop of Clonfert), an eminent promoter of science, Dr. Whitley Stokes, Fellow of Dublin College, and now Professor of Natural History in it, Mr. Blashford, a barrister, and others, adding every now and then new contributions to the Flora. At this time the late Mr. Templeton turned his attention to botany, and in 1793 had actually laid out that garden, known to all the botanists who have visited Belfast; that garden in which he made the interesting experiments on raising plants in the open air, previously found only in conservatories, communicated to the Royal Irish Academy in 1799; that garden which to this day is a monument of his zeal, his skill, and of that attachment to botany with which he inspired his family. In 1792, Dr. Brinkley came to Ireland as Professor of Astronomy, and he was an ardent botanist; Dr. Barker made out a list of the plants of his native county, Waterford, Mr. Tighe of those of Kilkenny; and the illustrious Robert Brown, being at Derry for some time previous to his going to New Holland, not only carefully examined that county, but extended his researches to the county of Donegal. All the gentlemen whose names I have mentioned were in communication with Mr. Templeton, and he was urged by most of them to undertake the Flora of Ireland, with a promise of assistance. In the meantime Dr. Wade published his Flora of the county Dublin in 1794. About the year 1800 the Dublin Society established a professorship of botany, which was filled by Dr. Wade, and began the Glasnevin garden, having Mr. Underwood for their first gardener. The parliamentary grant for this purpose was procured chiefly by the

Society in Dublin; of the rare plants of Waterford, Cork, and Kerry, the three most southern counties, by Dr. Charles Smith, whose accuracy is admitted, and communications to the lists of How, Merret, and Ray, of the most remarkable plants that had yet been found in the country. We have now to inquire what progress was made in Ireland after 1780, and previous to Mr. Mackay's labours. In 1785, the Lectureship on Botany in the University was changed by Act of Parliament to a professorship, and annual courses of lectures were made imperative. Dr. Edward Hill, who had been lecturer, was the first professor, and continued to fill the chair till his death in 1801. I have not heard any character of his lectures, but it is reasonable to suppose that the increasing love of botany, which led to the change in the College, and to other circumstances, must have originated with him. Be this as it may, we find Dr. Robert Scott, who was afterwards his successor, Dr. Wade, Dr. Young, a fellow of Dublin College (afterwards bishop of Clonfert), an eminent promoter of science, Dr. Whitley Stokes, Fellow of Dublin College, and now Professor of Natural History in it, Mr. Blashford, a barrister, and others, adding every now and then new contributions to the Flora. At this time the late Mr. Templeton turned his attention to botany, and in 1793 had actually laid out that garden, known to all the botanists who have visited Belfast; that garden in which he made the interesting experiments on raising plants in the open air, previously found only in conservatories, communicated to the Royal Irish Academy in 1799; that garden which to this day is a monument of his zeal, his skill, and of that attachment to botany with which he inspired his family. In 1792, Dr. Brinkley came to Ireland as Professor of Astronomy, and he was an ardent botanist; Dr. Barker made out a list of the plants of his native county, Waterford, Mr. Tighe of those of Kilkenny; and the illustrious Robert Brown, being at Derry for some time previous to his going to New Holland, not only carefully examined that county, but extended his researches to the county of Donegal. All the gentlemen whose names I have mentioned were in communication with Mr. Templeton, and he was urged by most of them to undertake the Flora of Ireland, with a promise of assistance. In the meantime Dr. Wade published his Flora of the county Dublin in 1794. About the year 1800 the Dublin Society established a professorship of botany, which was filled by Dr. Wade, and began the Glasnevin garden, having Mr. Underwood for their first gardener. The parliamentary grant for this purpose was procured chiefly by the

exertions of the Right Hon. J. Foster, Speaker of the House of Commons, who had long been a zealous promoter of botany, and was considered to be well acquainted with it as a science. In 1801 Dr. Scott was elected professor in the College, and the board which has the direction of the College funds determined on having a suitable garden of their own, and engaged Mr. Mackay as curator, who came to Ireland about 1803 or 1804. In 1807 the proprietors of the Cork institution determined on having a garden, and engaged Mr. James Drummond as their curator. Previously to this, Mr. Templeton had a list of 815 species of phænogamous plants with their habitats, whilst his list of mosses, lichens, fuci, and fungi, was even more extensive in proportion. Thus early too, Miss Hutchins also had devoted herself to botanical pursuits, and had carefully examined the neighbourhood of Bantry Bay for phænogamous plants, though her chief discoveries were in the Algæ. The county surveys were at this time publishing under the auspices of the Dublin Society, in some of which lists of rare plants were given. It has been objected that the natural history part of these surveys is of little use, but it should be remembered that agriculture and statistics were the chief object, and we may surely ask whether the county surveys of England and Scotland displayed a more accurate knowledge of natural history? I date 1804 as the period from which Mr. Mackay's labours commenced, and I think I have a right to conclude, not only that the botany of Ireland was tolerably well known before he came, but also that if a considerable desire of promoting the science had not been previously formed, the parliament, the Dublin Society, and the heads of the university would not have incurred such a heavy expense as to establish two gardens, maintain two professors, and employ two able curators. It was not these gentlemen who first formed the taste, but their engagement was the result of its having been already formed. The Dublin Society not only had their garden, but they employed an under gardener in going through the country, and enabled their professor to travel in the west, publishing the result of his tour. In like manner the College employed Mr. Mackay in visiting the south and west, and the Cork institution sent Mr. Drummond into the west of their county and the county of Kerry. Mr. Mackay's catalogue of rare plants, printed in 1806, and Mr. Drummond's list of the plants of the county Cork, printed in 1810, both at the expense of the Dublin Society, show the result of these missions. It is no reflection on these gentlemen to observe, that having been employed for the purpose, they were able to do more than

exertions of the Right Hon. J. Foster, Speaker of the House of Commons, who had long been a zealous promoter of botany, and was considered to be well acquainted with it as a science. In 1801 Dr. Scott was elected professor in the College, and the board which has the direction of the College funds determined on having a suitable garden of their own, and engaged Mr. Mackay as curator, who came to Ireland about 1803 or 1804. In 1807 the proprietors of the Cork institution determined on having a garden, and engaged Mr. James Drummond as their curator. Previously to this, Mr. Templeton had a list of 815 species of phænogamous plants with their habitats, whilst his list of mosses, lichens, fuci, and fungi, was even more extensive in proportion. Thus early too, Miss Hutchins also had devoted herself to botanical pursuits, and had carefully examined the neighbourhood of Bantry Bay for phænogamous plants, though her chief discoveries were in the Algæ. The county surveys were at this time publishing under the auspices of the Dublin Society, in some of which lists of rare plants were given. It has been objected that the natural history part of these surveys is of little use, but it should be remembered that agriculture and statistics were the chief object, and we may surely ask whether the county surveys of England and Scotland displayed a more accurate knowledge of natural history? I date 1804 as the period from which Mr. Mackay's labours commenced, and I think I have a right to conclude, not only that the botany of Ireland was tolerably well known before he came, but also that if a considerable desire of promoting the science had not been previously formed, the parliament, the Dublin Society, and the heads of the university would not have incurred such a heavy expense as to establish two gardens, maintain two professors, and employ two able curators. It was not these gentlemen who first formed the taste, but their engagement was the result of its having been already formed. The Dublin Society not only had their garden, but they employed an under gardener in going through the country, and enabled their professor to travel in the west, publishing the result of his tour. In like manner the College employed Mr. Mackay in visiting the south and west, and the Cork institution sent Mr. Drummond into the west of their county and the county of Kerry. Mr. Mackay's catalogue of rare plants, printed in 1806, and Mr. Drummond's list of the plants of the county Cork, printed in 1810, both at the expense of the Dublin Society, show the result of these missions. It is no reflection on these gentlemen to observe, that having been employed for the purpose, they were able to do more than

exertions of the Right Hon. J. Foster, Speaker of the House of Commons, who had long been a zealous promoter of botany, and was considered to be well acquainted with it as a science. In 1801 Dr. Scott was elected professor in the College, and the board which has the direction of the College funds determined on having a suitable garden of their own, and engaged Mr. Mackay as curator, who came to Ireland about 1803 or 1804. In 1807 the proprietors of the Cork institution determined on having a garden, and engaged Mr. James Drummond as their curator. Previously to this, Mr. Templeton had a list of 815 species of phænogamous plants with their habitats, whilst his list of mosses, lichens, fuci, and fungi, was even more extensive in proportion. Thus early too, Miss Hutchins also had devoted herself to botanical pursuits, and had carefully examined the neighbourhood of Bantry Bay for phænogamous plants, though her chief discoveries were in the Algæ. The county surveys were at this time publishing under the auspices of the Dublin Society, in some of which lists of rare plants were given. It has been objected that the natural history part of these surveys is of little use, but it should be remembered that agriculture and statistics were the chief object, and we may surely ask whether the county surveys of England and Scotland displayed a more accurate knowledge of natural history? I date 1804 as the period from which Mr. Mackay's labours commenced, and I think I have a right to conclude, not only that the botany of Ireland was tolerably well known before he came, but also that if a considerable desire of promoting the science had not been previously formed, the parliament, the Dublin Society, and the heads of the university would not have incurred such a heavy expense as to establish two gardens, maintain two professors, and employ two able curators. It was not these gentlemen who first formed the taste, but their engagement was the result of its having been already formed. The Dublin Society not only had their garden, but they employed an under gardener in going through the country, and enabled their professor to travel in the west, publishing the result of his tour. In like manner the College employed Mr. Mackay in visiting the south and west, and the Cork institution sent Mr. Drummond into the west of their county and the county of Kerry. Mr. Mackay's catalogue of rare plants, printed in 1806, and Mr. Drummond's list of the plants of the county Cork, printed in 1810, both at the expense of the Dublin Society, show the result of these missions. It is no reflection on these gentlemen to observe, that having been employed for the purpose, they were able to do more than

those who could scarcely be expected to take long journeys at their own expense, merely for the sake of science. The same may be said of later discoveries, made under the Ordnance department. What has been done by such men as Messrs Mackay, Drummond, and Moore, (and no one can more cheerfully acknowledge that they have done much) is to their honour, but should never be brought forward to the disparagement of those who were mere voluntary labourers. I now leave it to the judgement of the reader, whether it was fair to attribute almost all to Mr. Mackay and his contemporaries, or to use language which might appear to a stranger to imply, that even in 1833 the botany of Ireland had remained amongst its enlightened inhabitants *almost a sealed book*.

[To be continued.]

II.—On Sphæronites and some other genera from which *Crinoidea* originate. By L. VON BUCH*.

PERHAPS there are few schemes of general structure sketched by Nature within whose circle so many and so variously modified forms have been unfolded as the beautiful Lilies of the Ocean, the *Encrinites* or *Crinoidea*. From their simple origin they diffuse themselves in every direction to the most wonderfully complex and numerous forms, and then suddenly return in the progress of creation to a proportionately small number; so much so, that of the numerous genera and species of the primitive age, only the solitary *Pentacrinus* has come down to our present period. But other forms have unfolded and diffused themselves in all oceans. The corolla of the lily has again closed, and perfectly enveloped *Asteriæ* and *Echini*, capable of greater movement and development, have taken the place of the *Crinoidea*.

No formation can produce a greater number of the most varied forms of these creatures of the primitive age, than the transition formation from the oldest strata to the carbonaceous series. Their chief character in this period is, that the parts which envelope the body have still greatly the superiority over the auxiliary members which are to convey the nutriment, the far-spread many-fingered arms. This body becomes smaller and smaller, and consists of fewer pieces in the Jura formation; the arms and fingers are on the contrary longer, more compound, and in greater number. With *Comatula* or the *Euryalæ*, the body separates entirely

* Read before the Royal Academy of Sciences of Berlin, March 16, 1840, and translated from the *Berichte der Akademie*.

those who could scarcely be expected to take long journeys at their own expense, merely for the sake of science. The same may be said of later discoveries, made under the Ordnance department. What has been done by such men as Messrs Mackay, Drummond, and Moore, (and no one can more cheerfully acknowledge that they have done much) is to their honour, but should never be brought forward to the disparagement of those who were mere voluntary labourers. I now leave it to the judgement of the reader, whether it was fair to attribute almost all to Mr. Mackay and his contemporaries, or to use language which might appear to a stranger to imply, that even in 1833 the botany of Ireland had remained amongst its enlightened inhabitants *almost a sealed book*.

[To be continued.]

II.—On Sphæronites and some other genera from which *Crinoidea* originate. By L. VON BUCH*.

PERHAPS there are few schemes of general structure sketched by Nature within whose circle so many and so variously modified forms have been unfolded as the beautiful Lilies of the Ocean, the *Encrinites* or *Crinoidea*. From their simple origin they diffuse themselves in every direction to the most wonderfully complex and numerous forms, and then suddenly return in the progress of creation to a proportionately small number; so much so, that of the numerous genera and species of the primitive age, only the solitary *Pentacrinus* has come down to our present period. But other forms have unfolded and diffused themselves in all oceans. The corolla of the lily has again closed, and perfectly enveloped *Asteriæ* and *Echini*, capable of greater movement and development, have taken the place of the *Crinoidea*.

No formation can produce a greater number of the most varied forms of these creatures of the primitive age, than the transition formation from the oldest strata to the carbonaceous series. Their chief character in this period is, that the parts which envelope the body have still greatly the superiority over the auxiliary members which are to convey the nutriment, the far-spread many-fingered arms. This body becomes smaller and smaller, and consists of fewer pieces in the Jura formation; the arms and fingers are on the contrary longer, more compound, and in greater number. With *Comatula* or the *Euryalæ*, the body separates entirely

* Read before the Royal Academy of Sciences of Berlin, March 16, 1840, and translated from the *Berichte der Akademie*.

those who could scarcely be expected to take long journeys at their own expense, merely for the sake of science. The same may be said of later discoveries, made under the Ordnance department. What has been done by such men as Messrs Mackay, Drummond, and Moore, (and no one can more cheerfully acknowledge that they have done much) is to their honour, but should never be brought forward to the disparagement of those who were mere voluntary labourers. I now leave it to the judgement of the reader, whether it was fair to attribute almost all to Mr. Mackay and his contemporaries, or to use language which might appear to a stranger to imply, that even in 1833 the botany of Ireland had remained amongst its enlightened inhabitants *almost a sealed book*.

[To be continued.]

II.—On Sphæronites and some other genera from which *Crinoidea* originate. By L. VON BUCH*.

PERHAPS there are few schemes of general structure sketched by Nature within whose circle so many and so variously modified forms have been unfolded as the beautiful Lilies of the Ocean, the *Encrinites* or *Crinoidea*. From their simple origin they diffuse themselves in every direction to the most wonderfully complex and numerous forms, and then suddenly return in the progress of creation to a proportionately small number; so much so, that of the numerous genera and species of the primitive age, only the solitary *Pentacrinus* has come down to our present period. But other forms have unfolded and diffused themselves in all oceans. The corolla of the lily has again closed, and perfectly enveloped *Asteriæ* and *Echini*, capable of greater movement and development, have taken the place of the *Crinoidea*.

No formation can produce a greater number of the most varied forms of these creatures of the primitive age, than the transition formation from the oldest strata to the carbonaceous series. Their chief character in this period is, that the parts which envelope the body have still greatly the superiority over the auxiliary members which are to convey the nutriment, the far-spread many-fingered arms. This body becomes smaller and smaller, and consists of fewer pieces in the Jura formation; the arms and fingers are on the contrary longer, more compound, and in greater number. With *Comatula* or the *Euryalæ*, the body separates entirely

* Read before the Royal Academy of Sciences of Berlin, March 16, 1840, and translated from the *Berichte der Akademie*.